



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,566	08/22/2003	Ik Beom Jeon	1740-000056/US	8221

7590 01/09/2007
HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195

EXAMINER

DANIELSEN, NATHAN ANDREW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/645,566	Applicant(s) JEON ET AL.	
	Examiner Nathan Danielsen	Art Unit 2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 35-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 35-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/03/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 and 35-49 are pending. Claims 26-34 have been canceled in Applicant's preliminary amendment filed 03 December 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18-20, 24, 25, 36-38, 40, 41, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al (International Published Application WO 02/086873 and English equivalent US Patent Application Publication 2004/0156294; hereinafter Watanabe).

Regarding claims 1, 18, 20, and 38, Watanabe discloses a high-density recording medium (and associated methods of recording or reproducing) including one or more recording layers, the recording medium comprising:

a lead-in area including a control information required for recording or reproducing data on or from the recording medium (¶¶ 168 and figure 18); and

a burst cutting area located at an inner area other than the lead-in area, the burst cutting area including a plurality of data units (¶¶s 167-175, specifically ¶¶ 168, and figure 18; where the plurality of data units are located on different layers);

wherein additional information is included in at least one data unit, the additional information including at least a medium type information that identifies what kinds of recording layers are included in the recording medium (¶¶s 78 and 168).

Regarding claim 2, Watanabe discloses where the medium type information indicates that the recording medium is a writable medium or read-only medium (¶¶ 78).

Regarding claim 4, Watanabe discloses where the additional information field is recorded in a first data unit (figure 18).

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding claims 6, 11, 36, and 49, Watanabe discloses where the control information in said lead-in area includes the additional information in the burst cutting area (suggested by ¶s 168 and 169).

Regarding claims 8, 19, and 40, Watanabe discloses where the additional information further includes layer information (¶s 78 and 168).

Regarding claim 10, Watanabe discloses where layer information represents the number of layers included in the recording medium (¶ 168).

Regarding claim 13, Watanabe discloses where the additional information includes a reflectivity information, the reflectivity information indicating the reflectivity of the recording medium (¶ 78; where it is well known that read-only, writable, and rewritable layers have significantly differing reflectivities).

Regarding claim 24, Watanabe discloses where the identifying and reading steps identify/read the information preferentially when the recording medium is loaded in a recording or reproducing apparatus (figure 20).

Regarding claims 25, 37, 47, and 48, Watanabe discloses where the identifying step identifies the information in an early stage of recording or reproducing data on or from the recording medium and at an early stage of a drive start-up procedure (figure 20).

Regarding claim 41, Watanabe discloses processing the read information included in at least one data unit to identify the information (inherent in ¶ 78 and 168 when the various kinds of disclosed information is recorded in the BCA).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2627

5. Claims 1, 6, 15-18, 20, 22, 25, 36-39, 43, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ueda et al (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0007545; hereinafter Ueda), in view of Vining et al (US Patent 6,377,526; hereinafter Vining).

Regarding claims 1, 18, 20, and 38, Ueda discloses a high-density recording medium (and associated methods of recording or reproducing (as shown in figure 5; where method steps not explicitly stated are inherent in figure 5)) including one or more recording layers, the recording medium comprising:

a lead-in area including a control information required for recording or reproducing data on or

from the recording medium (figure 1A); and

a burst cutting area located at an inner area other than the lead-in area, the burst cutting area

including a plurality of data units (figure 1B);

wherein additional information is included in at least one data unit, the additional information

including at least a medium type information (abstract).

However, Ueda fails to disclose where the medium type information identifies what kinds of recording layers are included in the recording medium.

In the same field of endeavor, Vining discloses medium type information where one byte is dedicated to identifying the type of disk the control data has been recorded on (col. 5, lines 37-48 and col. 2, lines 37-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used different bit/byte values in control data to indicate medium type information, as taught by Vining, for the purposes of determining the type of medium in the drive as well as to provide support and expansion capabilities for new types of media (col. 5, lines 37-48).

Regarding claims 6, 36, and 49, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1, 18, and 38, respectively. Additionally, Ueda discloses where the control information in said lead-in area includes the additional information in the burst cutting area (abstract).

Regarding claims 15, 22, and 43, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1, 18, and 38. However, Ueda fails to disclose where the medium type information

Art Unit: 2627

represents the type of a BD-ROM (BD-Read Only memory), a BD-R (BD-Recordable), or BD-RE (BD-Rewritable).

In the same field of endeavor, Vining discloses where one byte is dedicated to identifying the type of disk the control data has been recorded on (col. 5, lines 37-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used different bit/byte values in control data to indicate medium type information, as taught by Vining, for the purposes of determining the type of medium in the drive as well as to provide support and expansion capabilities for new types of media (col. 5, lines 37-48).

Regarding claims 16 and 39, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1 and 38, respectively. However, Ueda fails to disclose where the data unit comprises a plurality of information bytes, the medium type information is included in at least one information byte.

In the same field of endeavor, Vining discloses where the data unit comprises a plurality of information bytes, the medium type information is included in at least one information byte (figure 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included medium type information in at least one information byte of a plurality of control data bytes, as taught by Vining, for the purpose of identifying the type of medium in the drive (col. 5, lines 37-48).

Regarding claim 17, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 16. However, Ueda fails to disclose where the medium type information is included in the first information byte in each data unit.

In the same field of endeavor, Vining discloses a byte for indicating the medium type (figure 4). However, this byte in Vining is not the first byte of the data unit shown in figure 4. Therefore, absent criticality for including medium type information in the first information byte in each data unit, locating this information in this byte is considered to be an arrangement of data. Where certain types of descriptive material, such as mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, are merely stored so as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing processes performed by the computer, then such descriptive material

Art Unit: 2627

alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer. Furthermore, Haneji suggests that the exact location of this data within the plurality of data units, and thus within the BCA (PEP) area, is irrelevant as long as this data is located somewhere within the data units and is therefore reproduced prior to reproducing data from any other location on the recording medium (col. 1, lines 25-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included medium type information in at least one information byte of a plurality of control data bytes, as taught by Vining, for the purpose of identifying the type of medium in the drive (col. 5, lines 37-48). Furthermore, absent criticality for including medium type information in the first information byte in each data unit, locating this information in this particular location is considered to be a mere arrangement of data and is thus considered to be an obvious matter of design choice.

Regarding claims 25, 37, 47, and 48, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 18 and 38. Additionally, Ueda discloses where the identifying step identifies the information in an early stage of recording or reproducing data on or from the recording medium and at an early stage of a drive start-up procedure (¶¶s 48 and 49 and figures 4 and 5).

6. Claims 2, 13, 14, 23, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda, in view of Vining, and further in view of Haneji (US Patent 5,124,962).

Regarding claim 2, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 1. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where the medium type information indicates that the recording medium is a writable medium or read-only medium.

In the same field of endeavor, Haneji discloses where the medium type information indicates that the recording medium is a writable medium or read-only medium (col. 2, lines 16-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used control information to indicate if a recording medium is a writable or read-only type, as taught by Haneji, for the purpose of setting drive conditions of an optical disk (col. 2, lines 3-5).

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding claims 13, 14, 23, and 44, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1, 18, and 38. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where the additional information includes a reflectivity information, the reflectivity information indicating the reflectivity of the recording medium, where the reflectivity information is required for an optical power control or an automatic gain control when a data recording or reproducing operation is carried out.

In the same field of endeavor, Haneji discloses where the additional information includes a reflectivity information, the reflectivity information indicating the reflectivity of the recording medium (col. 2, lines 6-16), where the reflectivity information is required for an optical power control or an automatic gain control when a data recording or reproducing operation is carried out (col. 2, lines 6-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used control information to indicate the reflectivity of a recording medium, as taught by Haneji, for the purpose of setting drive conditions of an optical disk (col. 2, lines 3-5).

7. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda, in view of Vining, and further in view of Miyasaka (US Patent 4,972,399).

Regarding claim 3, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 1. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where each data unit is preceded by sync information.

In the same field of endeavor, Miyasaka discloses where each data unit is preceded by synch information (figure 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included sync information in the control data area, as taught by Miyasaka, for the purposes of ensuring access to and reading out of disk characteristic data (col. 1, lines 48-51).

Regarding claim 4, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 3. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where the additional information field is recorded in a first data unit.

Art Unit: 2627

In the same field of endeavor, Miyasaka discloses where the additional information field is recorded in a first data unit (figure 4, where the single block of 128 data bits is considered to be the same as the claimed first data unit).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have put additional information in a first data unit, as taught by Miyasaka, for the purposes of ensuring access to and reading out of disk characteristic data (col. 1, lines 48-51).

8. Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda, in view of Vining, and further in view of Ishida et al (US Patent 6,208,603; hereinafter Ishida).

Regarding claims 5 and 21, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1 and 18. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where the additional information is repeatedly recorded in each data unit.

In the same field of endeavor, Ishida discloses where additional information is repeatedly recorded in each data unit (col. 14, lines 53-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recorded information in duplicate, as taught by Ishida, for the purpose of more reliably reproducing it (col. 14, line 64 through col. 15, line 33; more specifically col. 15, lines 13-15).

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda, in view of Vining, and further in view of Dieleman et al (US Patent 5,341,356; hereinafter Dieleman).

Regarding claim 7, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 6. Additionally, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses a lead-out area (element 105 in figure 1A). However, Ueda fails to disclose where the lead-out area contains control information.

In the same field of endeavor, Dieleman discloses where the lead-out area contains control information (abstract).

Art Unit: 2627

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included control information in a lead-out area, as taught by Dieleman, for the purpose of controlling reading of the information in all of the recorded information volumes (abstract).

10. Claims 8-12, 19, 24, 35, 40, 41, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda, in view of Vining, and further in view of the Applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter the AAPA).

Regarding claims 8, 19, and 40, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1, 18, and 41. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where the additional information further includes layer information.

In the same field of endeavor, the AAPA discloses where the additional information further includes layer information (page 3, lines 10-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included layer information in the additional information, for the purpose of determining which layer is the currently recorded/reproduced layer (page 3, lines 10-15).

Regarding claims 9, 35, and 45, Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 8, 18, and 38. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where the additional information further includes a sequence number to identify a data unit.

In the same field of endeavor, the AAPA discloses where the additional information further includes a sequence number to identify a data unit (3-byte sector number information in page 2, line 4 and figure 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included layer information in the additional information, for the purpose of identifying the sector which is the currently being recorded/reproduced (page 2, lines 2-4).

Regarding claim 10, Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 8. However, Ueda, in view of Vining, fails to disclose where layer information represents the number of layers included in the recording medium.

In the same field of endeavor, the AAPA discloses where layer information represents the number of layers included in the recording medium (page 3, lines 10-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included layer information in the additional information, for the purpose of determining which layer is the currently recorded/reproduced layer (page 3, lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 11, Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 10. Additionally, Ueda discloses where the control information in said lead-in area includes the additional information in the burst cutting area (elements 106 and 107 in figure 1B and elements 110 and 111 in figure 2C).

Regarding claim 12, Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 9. Additionally, Ueda discloses where the additional information further includes an application indicator to indicate a use for a copy protection system (element 106 in figure 1B).

Regarding claims 24 and 46, Ueda, in view of Vining, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 18 and 38. However, Ueda fails to disclose where the identifying and reading steps identify/read the information preferentially when the recording medium is loaded in a recording or reproducing apparatus.

In the same field of endeavor, the AAPA discloses where the identifying and reading steps identify/read the information preferentially when the recording medium is loaded in a recording or reproducing apparatus (page 3, lines 16-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have read the control information first, as taught by the AAPA, for the purpose of normally carrying out a data recording or reproducing operation corresponding to the read information (page 3, lines 21-22).

Regarding claim 41, Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 40. Additionally, Ueda discloses processing the read information included in at least one data unit to identify the information (figure 5).

Art Unit: 2627

11. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, and further in view of Ishida.

Regarding claim 42, Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 41. Additionally, Ueda discloses where the processing step processes the read information included in each data unit to identify the information (figure 5). However, Ueda, in view of Vining and the AAPA, fails to disclose where the information is repeatedly included in each data unit.

In the same field of endeavor, Ishida discloses where additional information is repeatedly recorded in each data unit (col. 14, lines 53-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recorded information in duplicate, as taught by Ishida, for the purpose of more reliably reproducing it (col. 14, line 64 through col. 15, line 33; more specifically col. 15, lines 13-15).

12. Claims 15-17, 22, 39, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Watanabe, in view of Vining, as explained in ¶ 5 of this Office Action.

13. Claims 14, 23, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Haneji, as explained in ¶ 6 of this Office Action.

14. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, in view of Miyasaka, as explained in ¶ 7 of this Office Action.

15. Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, in view of Ishida, as explained in ¶ 8 of this Office Action.

16. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, in view of Dieleman, as explained in ¶ 9 of this Office Action.

Art Unit: 2627

17. Claims 9, 12, 35, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, in view of the AAPA, as explained in ¶ 10 of this Office Action.

18. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, in view of the AAPA, and further in view of Ishida, as explained in ¶ 11 of this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 18, and 38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Closing Remarks/Comments

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Danielsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4248. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on (571) 272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nathan Danielsen
01/05/2007

ND


THANG V. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER